



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/382,553	08/25/1999	THANH TRAN	99-P-7755-US	5370

7590 12/17/2004

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT
170 WOOD AVE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

KNOWLIN, THJUAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/382,553

Applicant(s)

TRAN ET AL.

Examiner

Thjuan P Knowlin

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al (US 4,933,967).
2. In regards to claims 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 30, Lo discloses a communication network, manager, and method (network 10), comprising: at least one instance of a first object type (system 12-14) associated with a first product of the communication network; at least one instance of a second object type (switch 11) associated with a second product of the communication network; a network management server (administrator 19) and a network management client (administrator 29) including a graphical user interface adapted for enabling a user (subscribers 25-28) to invoke the network management server (Fig. 2, col. 5 lines 1-20, and col. 5-6 lines 58-11). Lo, however, does not disclose separate local means or separate instance configuration of the first and second object types. The coordinating configuration described in Lo, provides the same function as that of the present invention, in which separate local means and configuration of the first and second object types are used. The network, of both Lo and the present invention, allow for the

Art Unit: 2642

simultaneous moving and updating of phone mail services and PBX extensions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate the operation of phone mail services and PBX extensions into separate processes, as a way of transferring services and extensions simultaneously within a network.

3. Lo discloses all of claims 4, 8, and 16 limitations, except the communication network and manager comprising a CORBA compliant interface between the product specific coordinator and the first local means. However, any type of interface (col. 4 lines 38-42) could be used between the coordinator and local means.

4. In regards to claims 5, 7, 17, and 19, Lo discloses the communication network and manager, wherein the network coordinator includes means for accessing network object data from a directory server (Fig. 1-2, element 20, 21, 23, and 201, and col. 10-11 lines 62-9).

5. Lo, discloses all of claims 6, 18, and 25 limitations, except the communication network, manager, and method, wherein the directory server is LDAP compliant. However, the directory server disclosed by Lo, performs the same function as that of an LDAP compliant server.

6. In regards to claim 27, Lo discloses the method, wherein the step of configuring the first component comprises taking an action selected from the group comprising removing, adding, and changing the first component (col. 2 lines 53-66 and col. 5 lines 1-20).

7. In regards to claim 29, Lo discloses the method, wherein the step of configuring the second component comprises taking an action selected from the group comprising removing, adding, and changing the second component (col. 5 lines 1-20 and col. 6 lines 1-15).

8. In regards to claims 31, 33, and 34, Lo discloses a communication network, wherein said network object comprises a person object and said first component is a PBX component and said second component is a phone mail component (Fig. 2, col. 5 lines 1-20, and col. 5-6 lines 58-11).

9. In regards to claims 32 and 35, Lo discloses a communication network, wherein said network object comprises identifies a plurality of components associated with said network object (col. 2 lines 53-66, col. 5 lines 1-20, and col. 6 lines 1-15).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 08/04/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Lo does not provide either separate local means or separate instance configuration of the first and second object types. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. The coordinating configuration described in Lo, provides the same function as that of the present invention, in which separate local means and configuration of the first and second object types are used. The network, of both Lo and the present invention, allow for the simultaneous moving and updating of phone email services and PBX extensions. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the operation of

phone mail services and PBX extensions into separate processes, as a way of transferring services and extensions simultaneously within a network. Applicants further argue that Lo does not allow a user to identify a network (person) object and then perform multiple local configurations of multiple local objects. Lo, however, does allow a user to identify a network (person) object (subscribers 25-28) and then perform multiple local configurations of multiple local objects (col. 2 lines 53-66, col. 5 lines 1-20, and col. 6 lines 1-15).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bicknell et al (US 4,754,479) teach a station number portability. Emerson et al (US 4,646,346) teach an integrated message service system. Matthews et al (US 4,602,129) teach an electronic audio communications system with versatile message delivery.

12. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thjuan P Knowlin whose telephone number is (703) 308-1727. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30pm.


15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on (703)305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/382,553
Art Unit: 2642

Page 7

Thjuan P. Knowlin


AHMAD F. MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700